

aviation. My record with labor is just as good as the next fellow's, and I will put mine, my percentage, up with that of the Senator from Illinois as to my support for labor.

But this is one time I want the aviation industry of this country to continue to be the best in the world. If they are going to take this stance and say we are going to bring the FAA bill down—that is what the Senator from Illinois is doing—then we will be here next week, in my opinion. We will probably vote on Monday to proceed. We then lay a cloture motion down and they will be around here a lot longer than they had expected.

If that is the procedure, if you want to get the fur up, that is fine. It suits me fine. I understand it, not to say that I like it. I understand the procedure and I understand the rules. I understand the rules pretty well.

So, I hope we can work something out, I say to the majority leader. I am prepared to offer some objections myself here.

Mr. SIMON. If the majority leader will yield for 1 minute?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to.

Mr. SIMON. I am all for the FAA bill. What was put on was neither in the House nor in the Senate on this bill. That can be put on—if you drop this provision, it can be put on the continuing resolution. There are a variety of ways of handling this.

I hope we can get it worked out.

Mr. FORD. I say to my friend, you can put this bill into the continuing resolution now.

Mr. SIMON. What we should not do is tack on a major labor-management provision on this thing—without hearings on what is a very controversial provision, I might add.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 1617

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now turn to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1617, the work force development bill; the reading be considered waived, all points of order be waived, the conference report be considered as agreed to, with a motion to reconsider laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall object on behalf of the ranking member, Senator KENNEDY and myself. I do object. There are a lot of good things in this. There are a lot of things we have been working on a long time. I regret that it is necessary, but I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1237

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No.

545, S. 1237, a bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to child pornography; further, that a substitute amendment which is at the desk, offered by Senators HATCH, BIDEN, and others, be considered and agreed to, the bill be deemed read a third time and passed as amended, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object. I have always opposed mandatory minimums. They are great politics. They are bad justice.

The Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, William Rehnquist, has admonished Congress not to put these mandatory minimums on. There are some particularly harsh ones here.

There is much in this bill to be commended. But if we can take the mandatory minimums off, I will remove any objection right away. Clearly we want to do everything we can to stop child pornography. But to say, for example, to an 18-year-old who is guilty of pornography with a 16-year-old, for two offenses you get life in prison, which is what this bill mandates—I am not sure that serves the cause of justice. I think we ought to leave that up to the judges, as Chief Justice Rehnquist has suggested. So I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2823

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, which has been laboriously negotiated and supported by, for instance, a call I received from the Ambassador to Mexico, former Congressman Jim Jones, and supported by the administration actively, I believe, by Vice President AL GORE.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be discharged from the Commerce Committee; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do plan to object to this, and I would like to take some time to explain it.

Mr. President, today, the Majority Leader asked unanimous consent to take up a bill—the Stevens/Breaux/Gilchrest bill—that would significantly weaken protections for dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by re-writing—gutting—the “dolphin safe” tuna labeling law that Senator BIDEN and I wrote and pushed into law in 1990.

Today, the \$1 billion U.S. canned tuna market is a “dolphin safe” market. Consumers know that the “dolphin safe” label means that dolphins were not harassed or killed.

Our definition of dolphin safe became law for all the right reasons. Those reasons are still valid today:

First, for the consumers, who were opposed to the encirclement of dolphins with purse seine nets and wanted guarantees that the tuna they consume did not result in harassment, capture and killing of dolphins;

Second, for the U.S. tuna companies, who wanted a uniform definition that would not undercut their voluntary efforts to remain dolphin safe;

Third, for the dolphins, to avoid harassment, injury and deaths by encirclement; and

Fourth, for truth in labelling.

Our law has been a huge success. Annual dolphin deaths have declined from 60,000 in 1990 to under 3,000 in 1995. Why mess with success?

The Stevens/Breaux/Gilchrest bill would permit more dolphins to be killed than are killed now.

The bill promotes the chasing and encirclement of dolphins, a tuna fishing practice that is very dangerous to dolphins. It does so by gutting the meaning of “dolphin safe”, the label which must appear on all tuna sold in the United States. The “dolphin safe” label has worked: it doesn't need to be “updated”, as the bill's sponsors claim.

A number of arguments have been made in support of the Stevens/Breaux/Gilchrest bill which I would like to refute at this time.

Bill supporters claim that it is supported by the environmental community. In fact, only a few environmental groups support the Stevens/Breaux/Gilchrest bill, while over 85 environmental, consumer, animal protection, labor and trade groups oppose the Stevens/Breaux/Gilchrest bill. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these groups be printed in the RECORD at this point. The fact is that the vast majority of environmental organizations in this country and around the world oppose the Stevens/Breaux bill.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Action for Animals, California
Americans for Democratic Action
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to animals
American Oceans Campaign
American Humane Association
Americans for Democratic Action
Animal Protection Institute
Ark Trust
Australians for Animals
Bellerive Foundation, Italy & Switzerland
Born Free Foundation
Brigantine New Jersey Marine Mammal Stranding Center
Cetacea Defence
Chicago Animal Rights Coalition
Clean Water Action
Coalition for No Whales in Captivity
Coalition Against the United States Exporting Dolphins, Fl.
Coalition for Humane Legislation
Colorado Plateau Ecology Alliance
Committee for Humane Legislation
Community Nutrition Institute
Defenders of Wildlife
Dolphin Project Interlock International
Dolphin Connection, California
Dolphin Freedom Foundation
Dolphin Defenders, Florida
Dolphin Data Base